

### **REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed on March 14, 2006 has been given careful consideration by applicant. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

#### **The Office Action**

**Claims 1-8, 11, 13-14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Al-Kazily et al (U.S. 6,621,589) in view of Heartling (U.S. 6,874,034).

**Claims 16-24** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Al-Kazily et al (U.S. 6,621,589) in view of Johnson (U.S. 5,930,350).

#### **Amendments to Claims 1, 6, 11 and 14**

The printing architectures of independent claims 1 and 6 have been amended to include an electrophotographic printer as the target device for the print job, wherein the electrophotographic printer further includes an imaging and exposing station, a photoreceptor, a developing station, a transferring station and a fusing station.

Similarly, the methods of independent claims 11 and 14 have been amended to include directing the print job to a target device, wherein the target device is an electrophotographic printer which further includes, an imaging and exposing station, a photoreceptor, a developing station, a transferring station and a fusing station.

As noted by the Office Action mailed on June 22, 2005, the limitation of an electrophotographic printer including an imaging and exposing station, a photoreceptor, a developing station, a transferring station and a fusing station, is novel over the prior art. Accordingly, the rejection of independent claims 1, 6, 11 and 14 and all claims depending from claims 1, 6 11 and 14 should be withdrawn.

#### **No Motivation to Combine the Cited References**

In the March 14, 2006 Office Action, the Examiner conceded that Al Kazily does not teach an agent service on the print server for receiving and at least temporarily retaining the print job attributes communicated from the client, wherein the plurality of print job attributes include distribution information including a first recipient name and a first telephone number associated with sending the print job as a fax to the first recipient.

Examiner reasons, however, that combining Johnson with Al Kazily would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Applicant respectfully traverses this position, and argues that there is no motivation for combining these references, since neither reference expressly or implicitly suggests combining the inventions.

Al Kazily teaches a central print system which distributes print jobs based upon user specified print job attributes. The March 14, 2006 Office Action notes that Al Kazily does not disclose including a telephone number or fax information in the print attributes. Furthermore, Al Kazily does not discuss any use of a telephone or fax machine in conjunction with the print system. Consequently, there is no need to combine any system of managing telephone or fax numbers, such as the one in Johnson, with the Al Kazily print system.

Conversely, Johnson teaches a system and method for automatically configuring speed dial settings on a telephone. The system includes a speed dial database **122** which stores user information after a user sends a communication to a recipient. The sender's phone number is then programmed as a speed dial setting on the recipient's telephone. While possible communications may include faxes and print jobs, the system in Johnson is only concerned with the ID and phone number of the sender, not the delivery and attributes of the communications themselves. As such, there is no motivation to combine any print system, such as the one in Al Kazily, with the speed dial system in Johnson.

In view of at least the foregoing reasons, the rejection of claims 16, 20 and 23, and all claims depending from claims 16, 20 and 23, should be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

For the reasons detailed above, it is submitted that Claims 1-8, 11, 13-24 are now in condition for allowance. The foregoing comments do not require unnecessary additional search or examination.

No additional fee is believed to be required for this Amendment After Final. However, the undersigned attorney of record hereby authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Deposit Account No. 24-0037.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to call Patrick R. Roche, at Telephone Number (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,  
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

Sept. 13, 2006  
Date

Patrick R. Roche  
Patrick R. Roche, Reg. No. 29,580  
1100 Superior Avenue, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579  
(216) 861-5582